

**Date:** Thursday 28 May 2026  
**Time:** 9,30am - Annual Plan Deliberations  
**Meeting Room:** Tasman Council Chamber  
**Venue:** 189 Queen Street, Richmond

---

## Tasman District Council

### Kaunihera Katoa

# MINUTES ATTACHMENTS

---

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
RCN26-05-3.1 Public Forum - Bruce Struthers	
Attachment 1 Bruce Struthers Speaking Notes.....	2

PUBLIC FORUM: Council provides the opportunity for public forum input at its ordinary meetings. The views and opinions expressed in public forum do not necessarily reflect the position of the Tasman District Council, Council officers or elected members

---

It was a long and difficult journey to be granted permission to speak to you on this occasion. I had hoped to share current events since May 3, but to preserve the integrity of the Annual Plan consultation process, I was asked to consider another topic.

An esteemed Environmental Policy Planner presented a subject by asking that you approve the undisputed fragments of Plan Change 79.

The local economy is like a SailGP race.

The tight weave of interlocking directorates of shared business interests in our housing industry form a carbon fibre sail powering development forward at breathtaking speed.

Until the wind dies and there is a crash.  
The crashes are splendid to behold, and expensive to fix.

A prophet of Berryfields warned us this day would come, in the May 8, 2024 long term plan submissions hearing, a few months before a madman returned to the White House.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H1XuNt9biDk&t=4355s>

In response, the quiet pre-notification of Plan Change 79 to a select few began that month. On 3 October 2024, a decision to notify the public was approved.

The winds soon calmed.

The Right Honorable Christopher Bishop unambiguously stated in July 2025 that **all** local government plan changes must stop.

<https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/government-stop-council-plan-changes>  
<https://www.beehive.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2025-07/Plan%20Stop%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>

The intent of the Minister of Housing is unambiguous.  
No more plan changes, with few exceptions, such as private plan changes.

Upon appeal by TDC, the "stop" order was lifted for plan change 81, not Plan Change 79.

The list of submitters to Plan Change 79 form a "who's who" of the movers and shakers. You would see them at any Nelson Tasman Regional Development Agency event. Careful scrutiny of submitters supporting Plan Change 79, particularly those represented by planning consultants, will make you realise this is a private plan change.

Plan Change 79 is a bespoke shopping list of infrastructure to enable development of real estate investments by the dominant developers in Tasman District. Look at shareholders and directors, and you have their names.

Only, the ratepayers of Tasman are stuck with the bill of consultation and evaluation by a supposedly independent panel of hearing commissioners. Stantec was asked to write the

supporting report that bundles up lollies for the developers to guarantee return on the speculator's investments in Richmond West, Māpua, Brightwater, ... Just as it is designing our very own road of national significance.

Tucked away in page 332 of the agenda for this meeting is "attachment three". It discloses personal information of submitters, such as name, address, email address of "people to be served".

The list is predominantly individuals with commercial interest in the sections within scope of the Plan. It is not clear what guarantees of privacy were made to these individuals, companies and consultants. All responses to requests for public information to this District apparently need to be reviewed by the "Democracy and Legal Services" department to protect privacy of individuals. Apparently the AI-assisted redactions engine missed this.

Changes to any Tasman District Resource Management Plan are very likely to be overridden should an amalgamated council be decided upon by Nelson City and Tasman Districts, or a central government solution is handed down.

Portions of Plan Change 79 are contested in the Environmental Court. There is no guarantee that provisions considered out of scope of the legal proceedings by the report author will be interpreted as such by the Court. Council incurs a legal risk by acting before the appeal has been decided. The appellant is likely to have the deep pockets to take any adverse decision before the High Court. Does the Council?

The tired technique of creating artificial urgency to require elected members to approve part of Plan Change 79, without waiting for the Environmental Court to decide what is in and not within its discretion, is a technique used by THIS Council in last October's stealth addition of the Māpua Master Plan to Plan Change 81.

The growth anticipated in 2024 to lift deferrals on zoning is not guaranteed to appear. The "release of deferred land to clearly specified infrastructure requirements" have lost those requirements.

Further speculation by staff, to support real estate speculation by developers, wastes time and effort until the adopted Annual Plan has determined infrastructure priorities and who pays for them. Elected members may prioritise maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure, not to build castles in the sky for migrants that can no longer afford to come here.

Sailboat racing is a rich man's sport.

This District, at this time, cannot afford for Plan Change 79 to progress.

Bruce Struthers  
May 28, 2026